Docket No. 1982-0142P Appl. No. 09/496,266 Amendment dated November 4, 2004 Reply to Office Action of August 4, 2004 Page 13 of 16

REMARKS

Claims 2-8 and 10-20 are now pending in the present application. Claims 2, 3, 5-8, 10-20 have been amended. Claims 1 and 9 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter contained therein. Claims 3, 7, 8, 17 and 19 are independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Reasons for Entry of Amendments

It is respectfully requested that the present amendments be entered into the official file in view of the fact that the amendments to the claims automatically place the application into condition for allowance.

If the Examiner does not believe that the application is in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to enter the amendment for the purposes of appeal. The amendments to the claims simplify the issues on appeal by amending the claims to include subject matter considered by the Examiner to be allowable.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 6, 9-10, 13, 16 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakata et al., USPN 5,119,178 in view of Sakai et al., USPN 5,453,853. Claims 2 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Docket No. 1982-0142P Appl. No. 09/496,266

Amendment dated November 4, 2004

Reply to Office Action of August 4, 2004

Page 14 of 16

Sakata et al. in view of Sakai et al. and further in view of Udagawa et al., USPN 6,195,125.

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

As the Examiner will note, claims 1 and 9 have been canceled and the remaining

claims have been amended to depend from allowable independent claims. Accordingly,

the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 have been rendered moot with regard to

these claims.

With regard to dependent claims 2 and 6, these claims have been amended to

depend from independent claim 7. In addition, claims 16 and 18 have been amended to

depend from independent claim 19. In the Examiner's Office Action, the Examiner

indicated that claims 17 and 19 were directed to allowable subject matter. In view of this, it

is believed that claims 16 and 18 should now be in condition for allowance.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that

claims 2, 6, 16 and 18 clearly define the present invention over the references relied on by

the Examiner. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's rejections

under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3-5, 7, 8, 12, 14, 15, 17, 19 and 20 stand objected to as being dependent

upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form

including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Docket No. 1982-0142P Appl. No. 09/496,266 Amendment dated November 4, 2004 Reply to Office Action of August 4, 2004

Page 15 of 16

As the Examiner will note, claims 3, 7, 8, 17 and 19 have been amended to be in independent form including all of the limitations of independent claims 1 and 9, respectively. In view of this, independent claims 3, 7, 8, 17 and 19 and dependent claims 2, 5, 6, 10-16, 18 and 20 should now be in condition for allowance. Applicant submits that claims 5, 10-15 and 20 have been amended to depend from alternative, allowable independent claims in order to avoid potential double patenting.

Favorable consideration and early allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Since the remaining reference cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but merely to show the state-of- the-art, no further comments are deemed necessary with respect thereto.

All the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed and/or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently pending rejections and that they be withdrawn.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

Docket No. 1982-0142P Appl. No. 09/496,266 Amendment dated November 4, 2004 Reply to Office Action of August 4, 2004 Page 16 of 16

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Paul C. Lewis, Registration No. 43,368 at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

Marc S. Weiner, #32,181

Paul C. Lewis, #43,368

P.O. Box 747

MSW/PCL/cl

1982-0142P

Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000